

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are presented for further examination. Claim 1 has been amended, and claims 2-19 are new.

In the first Office Action mailed October 14, 2004, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,641,087 ("Nelson"). The Examiner also objected to informalities in claim 1.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the basis for the rejection and requests reconsideration and further examination of the claims.

The foregoing amendment to claim 1 has overcome the objections raised by the Examiner. In addition, applicant is submitting herewith a substitute formal Figure. No new matter has been added. All reference numbers and a key now appear in the Figure. Applicant respectfully requests approval and entry of the substitute formal Figure in the application.

Claim 1 and new independent claims 11, 13, and 17-19 are all directed to the automatic protection of an aircraft from collision with an object without requiring human intervention or in spite of human intervention, such as unauthorized actions of hijackers or even the flight crew. Any action that directs the aircraft to a collision course with any object in the air or ground, including the ground or water, will be automatically detected and overridden.

Nelson, U.S. Patent No. 6,641,087, describes an anti-hijacking system that requires human intervention to activate the system. This is summarized in the Abstract wherein Nelson requires activation of a "panic button" by the flight crew or receipt of override signals from a remote guidance facility outside the aircraft. Nelson further describes at col. 5, lines 20-60, the remote guidance facilities as including "carefully screened personnel." Nowhere does Nelson teach the automatic prevention of aircraft collision as set forth in the present claimed invention.

Moreover, in the present invention, the auto-controlling and piloting system (ACPS) 40 is connected to the autopilot 80 by line 10 and is also connected directly to the aircraft systems 80, 90, 100, 110, 120, 130, 14, 150, 160, and 170 by line 10 through the anticrash system (ACS) 20. Thus, the present invention automatically overrides the autopilot if necessary to avoid a collision. Nelson, on the other hand, teaches at col. 8 lines 35-36, "still

leaving the autopilot's functionality intact" while deactivating the keypad to the autopilot. In addition, Nelson describes inputting command and control signals through the autopilot to direct the aircraft's flight path (see col. 8, lines 50-52). The present invention does not require use of the autopilot.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in this application, i.e. claims 1-19, are clearly novel over the Nelson reference. In the event the Examiner disagrees or finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicant's undersigned representative by telephone at (206) 622-4900 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing this case to issuance is respectfully solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



E. Russell Tarleton

Registration No. 31,800

ERT:jl

Enclosures:

Postcard

1 Sheet of Drawings Figure 1

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

496884_1.DOC

Application No. 10/605,625
Reply to Office Action dated October 14, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1. This sheet, which includes Figure 1, replaces the original sheet including Figure 1.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet